Case: 3:11-cv-00093-MPM-SAA Doc #: 43-3 Filed: 05/25/12 1 of 2 PageID #: 1679



## **QUARTERLY STATEMENT**

AS OF JUNE 30, 2011
OF THE CONDITION AND AFFAIRS OF THE

	ACA Financ	cial Guaranty					
NAIC Group Code 0000 (Current Period)		IAIC Company Code	22896	Employer's ID	Number	52-1474358	
Organized under the Laws of	rganized under the Laws of Maryland		, State of Domicile or Port of Entry		Maryland		
Country of Domicile		Unite	d States				
Incorporated/Organized	06/25/1986	Comn	nenced Busines	s	10/31/19	986	
Statutory Home Office	7 Saint Paul Street, S	Suite 1660	Baltumore, MD				
Main Administrative Office	In Administrative Office 600 Fifth Avenue, 2nd Floor		New York, N	IV 10020	•	212-375-2000	
(Street and Number) Mail Address 600 Fifth Avenue, 2nd Floor			(Cily or Town, State and Zip Code) (Area Code) (Telephone Number) New York, NY 10020				
	Street and Number or P O Box)	- D-151	(City or Town, State New York, NY 10020				
Primary Location of Books and Reco	Location of Books and Records 600 Fifth Avenue, 2nd Floor (Street and Number)			K, NY 10020 State and Zip Code)	(Area	212-375-2000 Code) (Telephone Number	
Internet Web Site Address	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	http://	www.aca.com				
Statutory Statement Contact			212-375-2041 (Area Code) (Telephone Number) (Extension)				
(Name ecarew@aca.com		ame)	(Area Code) (Tele 212-375-210				
(E-Mail A	ddress)			(Fax Number)			
		OFFICERS					
Name			Name		Title		
Raymond John Brooks, Jr.			Steven Joseph Berkowitz #		Chief Legal Officer & COO		
Arnold Barry Jay Brousell							
	C	THER OFFICE	RS				
		CTORS OR TRU					
Raymond John Brooks, Jr	John Brooks, Jr Richard Joseph Caplan		Roger Dale Cunningham Paul Douglas McFarlane		Bradley Irving Dietz		
Willis Thomas King, Jr John Bruce Sprung	Dwight Edward La	acey Pau	Paul Douglas McFarlane		Andrew Nathan Rothseid		
State of New Yor	k .						
County of . New Yor							
The officers of this reporting entity being above, all of the herein described assets within statement, together with related exists but of the condition and affairs of the said reprompleted in accordance with the NAIC Arthal state rules or regulations require differespectively. Furthermore, the scope of the ward nopy (except for firmalting difference to the enclosed statement.)  Raymond John Brooks, J	vere the absolute property of th its, schedules and explanations orting entity as of the reporting insual Statement Instructions en rences in reporting not related is attestation by the described as due to electronic filing) of the	te said reporting entity, free therein contained, annexed period stated above, and of Accounting Practices and to accounting practices and officers also includes the re-	and clear from ar d or referred to, is of its income and it Procedures man in procedures, acco- lated correspondi electronic filing ma	ly liens or claims their a full and true statem deductions therefrom and except to the oxider of the oxide the control of the	reon, except a nent of all the n for the perio int that (1) st neir information ith the NAIC, i	is herein stated, and tha assets and liabilities and d ended, and have beet ato low may diffor, or, (2 in, knowledge and behel when required, that is a ars in lieu of or in addition	
President and Chief Executive		gal Officer & Chief Oper				ancial Officer	
			a ls th	ns an original filing?		Yes [ X ] No { ]	
Subscribed and sworn to before me this day of	: August, 2011		b If no	o, Itale the amendment	number		
11/11	11/11		2 Date filed				
Moderat			3 N	umber of pages allac	ched		
Nicolas/Kalcanides,							
	Q LT						
NICOL AS KALCA Notary Public - State o No. 01KA8227	of New York						

Qualified in New York County
My Commission Expires 9/7//4



STATEMENT AS OF JUNE 30, 2011 OF THE ACA Financial Guaranty Corporation

## **NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

The Company (specifically, ACA Management, LLC) is one of several defendants in an action pending in New Mexico state court brought by Frank Foy on behalf of the State of New Mexico The complaint alleges that Vanderbilt Capital Advisors (and certain affiliates) engaged in an unlawful "pay to play" scheme with various New Mexico state officials, causing New Mexico state agencies to purchase certain worthless CDO investments, including some with which the Company was allegedly connected. The complaint seeks compensatory damages in excess of \$90 million, plus interest and civil penalties which Plaintiff asserts raise the claim to several hundred million dollars, under certain New Mexico statutes, including the Fraud Against Taxpayers Act ("FATA") The Company moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of jurisdiction On April 28, 2010, without ruling on the Company's jurisdictional motion, the Court dismissed the complaint in its entirety on a number of grounds including constitutionality and lack of standing. Just before this dismissal was issued, the plaintiff filed an amended complaint which added a number of additional plaintiffs and legal theories. The Court subsequently entered an order striking all portions of the amended complaint inconsistent with the April 28 dismissal The only surviving portions of the amended complaint are allegations of FATA violations occurring after July 1, 2007 The Company has renewed its motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, and has also joined in a motion by all defendants to dismiss the amended complaint for failure to state a claim and for lack of subject matter jurisdiction In addition, the New Mexico Attorney General has asked the Court to dismiss portions of the lawsuit in favor of lawsuits filed by the New Mexico Attorney General relating to the underlying "pay to play" scheme (the Company is not named in those lawsuits)

The Company is a named defendant in New York State Supreme Court in a suit brought by its parent company Manifold Capital Corporation (f/k/a ACA Capital Holdings, Inc.) ("Manifold") for alleged breaches of an Intercompany Agreement dated August 6, 2008 (the "Intercompany Agreement") and entered into among the Company, Manifold, and then affiliates In particular, Manifold alleges that the Company breached the Intercompany Agreement by, among other acts, seeking a determination from the Maryland Insurance Administration (the "MIA") under a separate Escrow Agreement dated as of August 5, 2008 (the "Escrow Agreement"), that specified fees and expenses it incurred to the law firm Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson LLP ("Fried Frank") and the Blackstone Group ("Blackstone") were subject to indemnity under the Intercompany Agreement, and therefore, to be paid from the Escrow Account established under the Escrow Agreement Manifold further seeks a determination that the claims the Company has asserted for indemnity under the Intercompany Agreement are not covered claims and that the Company is hable for Manifold's legal fees and expenses incurred in enforcing its rights under the Intercompany Agreement The Company denies any liability to Manifold, is vigorously defending the lawsuit and has countersued Manifold for, among other claims, a declaration that its claims for Fried Frank and Blackstone fees are subject to indemnity and for recovery of its legal fees and expenses incurred to enforce its rights under the Intercompany Agreement. The extent of liability to the Company, if any, would be for the fees and expenses Manifold incurred in responding to the Company's claim before the MIA and in the Supreme Court action. The extent of any gain to the Company from a successful resolution to this hingshor would be for it to receive the aforementioned indemnification in addition to its fees and expenses incurred in pursuing its counterclaim

The Company was recently named as a defendant in a putative class-action in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi. The putative class purports to consist of all owners and/or holders of Connector 2000 Association, Inc. Toll Road Revenue Bonds (the "Connector Bonds") insured by the Company. The issuer of the Connector Bonds, Connector 2000 Association, Inc. (the "Issuer"), successfully confirmed a Chapter 9 plan (the "Plan"), and emerged from its bankruptcy proceeding on April 1, 2011. Pursuant to the terms of the Plan and by operation of law, the Connector Bonds were exchanged for new obligations of the Issuer (the "New Obligations") and were effectively cancelled. As a result, the Company asserts that the Connector Bonds are no longer enforceable obligations, and as such, neither is the guaranty obligation originally provided by the Company under its secondary market insurance policies. Because the Connector Bonds are no longer effective or enforceable obligations by virtue of the exchange effected under the Plan, and because the original guaranty issued by the Company in connection with the Connector Bonds under the Policy was not extended under the Plan or otherwise to the New Obligations, the Company asserts that it has no further liability or obligation under its policies. The Company's time to answer or otherwise move against the complaint is mid-August 2011.

The Company is a third-party defendant in a suit filed in the Fourth Judicial Circuit in Duval County, Florida. The Company insured \$11.65 million of bonds issued for the construction of a hospital and nursing facility in Macclenny, Florida. The bond documents required the hospital (i.e., the entity responsible for servicing the bonds insured by the Company) to procure and maintain a certain type of professional liability insurance. The hospital failed to comply with the professional liability insurance requirements under the bond documents and has commenced this action against the bond trustee to, among other things, be relieved of such obligation. In response, the bond trustee commenced a third party action against the Company demanding that the Company indemnify it for any liability the bond trustee may have to the hospital. The Company, in turn, brought a third-party action against the hospital and others seeking a declaration, inter alia, that the Company is either excused from its obligation under the bond insurance policy or that the hospital injust procure professional liability insurance as required by the bond documents. To date, the Company has successfully moved to strike a number of the hospital's affirmative defenses to the Company's third-party complaint and has successfully defended against the trustee's motion to dismiss certain claims in the Company's third-party complaint. The parties are now engaged in discovery on the remaining claims.

Various lawsuits against the Company have arisen in the course of the Company's business. Contingent liabilities arising from litigation, income taxes and other matters are not considered material in relation to the financial position of the results of operations of the Company.

## 15. LEASES

A In March 2010, ACA finalized negotiations with a new tenant for all of its office space at 140 Broadway. Under the terms of the transaction, ACA was released from its obligations under the lease, its security deposit of \$2.7 million was returned and it made eash payments of \$11.6 million. ACA recognized a loss of \$13.0 million on the lease termination, which included the carrying value of leasehold improvements and furniture and fixtures related to this space. The Company's rental expense for the quarters ended June 30, 2011 and 2010 was \$183.4 thousand and \$598.8 thousand, respectively.

In 2010, ACA finalized a sublease of new office space at 600 Fifth Avenue running through September 30, 2016 Minimum future lease payments under the lease are 2011-\$0.3 million, 2012-\$0.5 million, 2013-\$0.5 million, 2013-\$0.6 million, 2015-\$0.6 million, and 2016-\$0.5 million. The Company took possession of this space in July 2010